

The Independent

Of the University of Missouri

Vol. XII

Columbia, Mo., Saturday, May 27, 1905

Number 33

THE TRACK MEET.

The Missouri track team has again met Kansas and the result is the same old story. The only consolation the Jawhawkers can get out of it is that this meet was closer than any of the others that have been held. The fact is that it was the first time that Kansas had ever succeeded in making it interesting for the Missouri team, and as a victory after an interesting meet is better than a walk-away Missouri should be satisfied with the victory. Having won we certainly have no reason for finding any sore places about our person. Any dissatisfaction we may express with the relations existing between the two schools in these contests will not make us liable to the charge of being "hard losers" for we haven't lost. Rather than lay ourselves liable to that charge we have refrained from grumbling about little things in connection with football games, but here we need not refrain on account of that fear and conditions have indeed been such recently as to give us good reason to speak out on some of the practices of our opponent, our dearest foe.

The members of the track team and those in charge of the team, on the recent trip to Kansas are outspoken in their denunciation of the treatment which they received. They declare, not only that every unfair advantage was taken in the meet, but that the trickery of Kansas was of the crudest and coarsest kind. Far from trying to show any courtesy to the visiting team they took every advantage of their being visitors to give them the worst of the deal on every occasion. In the first place, in spite of an agreement to select starters several days before the meet, and of Missouri's having done everything which it was their duty to do in that selection, Kansas did not have the starters on hand when the time for the contest came. Instead of having a man to whom Missouri had agreed they chose one of their own managers, a man, indeed, who has tried to be honest at Kansas and who has lost his position as a result, who on account of his honesty has been declared false to Kansas' interests; and this man, no doubt fearing that to be fair on this occasion would bring about a renewal of the charges, refused to put back the men who left their marks before the signal for the start was given. In the 120 yard hurdle in which Salisbury was disqualified the performance of the Kansas managers was such as no person who pretends to be dominated by a spirit of fairness would be guilty. It is true that Salisbury took the hurdle which belonged to the other man, but in so doing he was not deliberately interfering with his opponent. On the contrary he did not even know that he was taking the wrong hurdle, and his failure to recognize the fact was due to the miserable condition of the track on which the event was run off. Instead of having a straight track as they should have for this race there is a turn at the finish and Salisbury's offense was to run straight ahead instead of turning with the track. It would seem that people with a shadow of fairness

would not think of taking advantage of their own poor facilities to gain a victory over honest opponents who had made a mistake wholly on account of those poor accommodations, but the Kansans most vigorously insisted in so doing, refusing even to run the race over, thus admitting that they knew that they had no chance to win it fairly. The disqualification of Nancrede was equally without cause or justification. In neither of the cases was there actual interference with the other runner. They simply took advantage of a technicality to force a referee before their own crowd to give them the benefit of a dirty deal. The limit of their unfairness is seen in their insisting on pulling off both the shot put and the high jump at the same time when they knew that the same man for Missouri was in both events. By this plan they won the high jump.

It is indeed hard to understand how any self-respecting institution can tolerate such practices, but these are facts which exist in connection with the recent meet held on the Kansas field. Nor is this the beginning of the muckerism which the Kansans practice. A short piece of the history of track meets between the two schools will show that they have not just fallen into the evil. In 1903 Kansas sent a team to Missouri to take part in a track meet. On that team was McCoy who had played football with the Oklahoma team at Missouri in the same year and had also played at Kansas. In reply to Missouri's protest those in charge of the team declared that they had investigated the matter and found McCoy eligible because he was in the preparatory department of Oklahoma at the time he took part in the Oklahoma track meets the previous year. A telegram to the authorities at Lawrence brought the same assurance from headquarters. But a telegram from Oklahoma brought the information that McCoy was entered as a regular student in the University of Oklahoma at the time he was a member of the track team there and as a result of that information the points won by him were not allowed to count in the meet. It would be had to reconcile these facts with fair dealing claims on the part of those who were responsible for them. But the limit of Kansas muckerism came last year when they absolutely refused to hold the meet with Missouri which they owed us and which should have been held at Lawrence. The reason was not that they did not have any track team for they held a meet with Oklahoma at the time proposed for the Missouri meet. The simple reason was that they knew that Missouri had a good team and that they had no chance to win. Talk about cold feet!

These are simple facts in connection with our track relations with Kansas. We have done little kicking about the treatment they have given us, for we are not all knockers all the time at Missouri. But we have come to the place where to silently receive without protest such treatment would be to forfeit self-respect and give open encouragement to most contemptible action on the

part of those from whom we have received it. On behalf of the students of the University of Missouri comes this protest. It is time to say to Kansas, "Be descent and fair in your dealings or look for other competitors." We can find competitors who have some sense of fairness to guide them in their activities, and even if we could not, better not compete at all than compete with such opponents. If college contests cannot be conducted in a spirit of fairness and sportsmanship only detriment can come to those who take part in them.

But while on this subject it may be noted that it is not in athletic contests alone that Kansas adopts these methods. The authorities in charge of debating at Missouri declare that they have never gone against such absolutely unfair and dishonest dealing before as that practiced by the Kansas debating authorities this year. They absolutely refused to abide by the rules for the selection of judges, would select no names but those of alumni of Kansas University or those whom they considered hostile to Missouri, and though they had no authority or no right to ask any man to serve as judge, it being Missouri's duty to ask the men selected to serve, they wrote to every man mentioned for the purpose and finally brought a man here with the understanding that he was to be a judge when Missouri had never heard of his being selected, indeed, when there had been under the rules three judges already chosen. They went to the further extent of trying to make Missouri pay the expenses of that fourth man.

It is against such treatment as this that Missouri is protesting. It is such as no self-respecting institution can put up with without protest. And it is to be noted that these are only a few of the more striking cases of the muckerism practiced by our Jayhawker opponents. There are many other things of smaller importance which are continually occurring. The spirit of unfairness seems to be in full control at Kansas and out of that fact have come conditions which are not to be tolerated by an institution which pretends to honorableness in its dealings with competitors. Missouri takes pride in the fact that our opponents get a square deal. We win when can fairly and honorably but we do not want victory bad enough to resort to dishonesty and unfairness of the most contemptible character. We do not want victory bad enough to compete with other schools that adopt such practices even when in such competition we can get such a straight string of victories as we have to our credit in Kansas track meets.

It will be two years before another track team goes to Kansas. Next year the meet will be held in Columbia if there is one, if Missouri does not have too good a team. Let no one say what is sometimes heard when such treatment has been received by teams away from home: "We'll get even when they come here." When the track team representing the University of Kansas

(Continued on Page Three.)